REMARKS

The Office Action of March 26, 2004 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 18, 20 and 25-42 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 18, 25, and 29 are independent claims. An Amendment mailed September 29, 2003 amended claims 1, 9, 18, 21 and 29. An Amendment faxed February 5, 2004, which was entered by filing an RCE faxed March 5, 2004, amended claims 18 and 29 and canceled claims 1-17 and 21-24.

This Amendment amends claims 18 and 29-30, cancels claim 19, and adds new claims 31-42. Support for the amendments is shown in Figures 10-12 and Applicant's specification page 24, line 20 through page 27, line 22.

1. Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103 of Claims 18-20 and 29-30

The Office Action in sections 4-7 on pages 2-4 rejects claims 18-20, 29, and 30 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spruck, U.S. 5,978,143 (hereinafter referred to as "Spruck") in view of Chevrette et al., U.S. Patent 5,774,179 (hereinafter referred to as "Chevrette").

Spruck discloses a stereoscopic recording and display system that includes two cameras focused on an intersect point of the two optical axes of the two cameras. Chevrette discloses a method for fast microscanning that uses a movable focus lens as more fully discussed in the Amendment mailed September 29, 2003, which discussion is incorporated herein by reference.

In response to the rejection, Applicant amends independent claims 18 and 29 to more clearly set forth what is believed to be Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully submits that Spruck taken singly or in combination with Chevrette fails to disclose or suggest as claimed by Applicant: simultaneously recording a plurality of views of an area having one or more objects with a plurality of cameras to produce a plurality of camera images of different portions of the area, where each camera has a lens positioned within a plane substantially orthogonal to an optical axis of the lens, wherein the view of each camera is positioned to record a portion of the area with at least one of the cameras having an offset lens to produce an oblique field of view of the portion it records of the area, and wherein the offset lens of the at least one camera may be shifted to one of a plurality of offsets.

In other words, Spruck taken singly or in combination with Chevrette fail to disclose or suggest an image acquisition system where a plurality of views of an area are simultaneously recorded with a plurality of cameras, where at least one of the plurality of cameras has an offset lens for producing an oblique field of view of the portion of the area it records, which offset lens may be shifted to any one of a plurality of offsets to record the appropriate region of the area.

Unlike Appicant, Spruck positions its two cameras to focus on the intercept point of the optical access of both cameras, where the intercept point is defined by the distance to an observer being recorded. Furthermore, interpreting Spruck to produce a stereoscopic using an offset lens having an oblique field of view would not change where the two cameras are focused, and therefore not change the output produced by the system. That is, Spruck teaches away from shifting the focus of its view with an offset lens because the purpose of the system is to produce a stereoscopic recording, which requires a focus on a single point, unlike Applicant's claims which recite that each camera has a lens positioned within a plane substantially orthogonal to an optical axis of the lens.

Further, the combination of Spruck with Cheverette would fail to produce Applicant's claimed invention as the combination would render a system for recording stereoscopic images with microscanning. Thus, in combination Spruck would produce two microscanned images that are later combined. That is, shifting images in Cheverette involves moving a lens a distance to increase the spatial and pixel resolution of the image that that camera records. However, there is no suggestion in their combination to uses a plurality of cameras with at least one having an offset lens to produce that effect. More speifically, Applicant's claims recite that *each* camera of its image acquisition system is positioned to record a portion of an area with one camera that has an offset lens, where the cameras of the image acquisition system simultaneously record images that are combined to produce a composite image having a higher resolution than the resolution of one or more of the simultaneously recorded views of the area.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 18 and 29 as amended are patentably distinguishable over Spruck in view of Chevrette. Insofar as claims 20, 30, 31-36, and 39-42 are concerned, these claims depend from one of now presumably allowable independent claims 18 or 29 and are also believed to be

in allowable condition.

2. Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103 of Claims 25-28

The Office Action in sections 8-12 on pages 4-7 rejects dependent claims 25-27 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson US 6,657,667 B1 (hereinafter referred to as "Anderson") in view of Chevrette et al., U.S. Patent 5,744,179 (hereinafter referred to as "Chevrette"). Further, the Office Action in section 13 on pages 7-8 rejects claim 28 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Chevrette, in further view of Kang et al., US 6,256,058 B1 (hereinafter referred to as "Kang").

Applicant respectfully submits that Anderson fails to disclose or suggest as claimed by Applicant: recording a first view of an area having one or more objects while a lens is positioned at an offset position within a plane substantially orthogonal to an optical axis of the lens while the camera is at a first position; and recording a second view of the area while the lens is positioned at the offset position within the plane after the camera is rotated to a second position.

Instead as disclosed in Anderson, the offset position of the lens within the plane orthogonal to the optical axis of the camera changes when the camera is rotated from scene selection 1 to scene selection 2, as described in column 6 and shown in Figure 6. More specifically, Anderson, similar to Kang, describes a camera that rotates about an axis that is perpendicular to its optical axis. Instead, Applicant's invention recited in independent claim 25 describes a camera that rotates about an axis parallel to the camera's optical axis to allow the lens of the camera to record two different views within a plane that is substantially orthogonal to the optical axis of the camera.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 25 is patentably distinguishable over Anderson taken singly or in combination with Chevrette and/or Kang. Insofar as claims 26-28 and 36-37 are concerned, these claims depend from one of now presumably allowable independent claim 25 and are also believed to be in allowable condition.

3. Fee Authorization And Extension Of Time

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment or response,

however, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025. This also constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and authorization to charge all fees therefor to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

4. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of this application and allowance thereof are earnestly solicited. In the event the Examiner considers a personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is hereby requested to call Attorney for Applicant(s), Thomas Zell.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Zell

Thomas Zell
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,481
Telephone: 650-812-4282
Date: 6/9/04